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Introduction
This study looks at transfer from L1 French and L1 English to the L2 Dutch. We specifically look at the ability to judge and imitate morphosyntactic and semantic structures with the quantitative pronoun ER.

Dutch
French
English

Syntax
presence vs absence
lees ER drie
Je EN la troisième
I read three

Semantics
indeffiniteness vs definiteness
Ik lees ER enehetdel
JE EN is un grand nombre
I read many

Ik lees ER de het
Je EN la moitié
I read half

Ik lees ER enkel
Je EN la quelques-uns
I read some

Ik lees ER sommige
Je EN la certains
I read some

Dutch and French have a quantitative pronoun that accompanies a

Comparison results French-Dutch and English-Dutch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SI</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>L1 French</th>
<th>L1 English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>✓ presence</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>p = 0.00865**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✗ absence</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>p = 0.000294***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantics</td>
<td>✓ (indeffiniteness)</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>p = 2.18e-05***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✗ (definiteness)</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>p = 0.08448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantics</td>
<td>✓ (non-presuppositionality)</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>p = 7.25e-10***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✗ (presuppositionality)</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>p = 0.1722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5/6 predictions confirmed
5/6 predictions confirmed

In the SI the L1 English speakers behaved as we expected, however the L1 French speakers did not: apparently they behave just like the L1 English speakers.

Discussion
Our predictions were based on Dutch being the L2 for both groups. However, all of the L1 French participants speak English too, and since all participants live in The Netherlands they come into contact with English on a regular basis. This leads to the idea that Dutch is in fact their L3.

Comparison results French-English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SI</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>L1 French</th>
<th>L1 English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>✓ presence</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>no difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✗ absence</td>
<td>no difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantics</td>
<td>✓ indefiniteness</td>
<td>no difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✗ definiteness</td>
<td>no difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ non-presuppositionality</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>no difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✗ presuppositionality</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>no difference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5/6 predictions confirmed
2/6 predictions confirmed

In the GJT the L1 French seems to have an influence on L2 Dutch, like we expected, BUT a comparison between the L1 French and the L1 English speakers shows that the L2 French speakers behave exactly the same as the L1 English speakers.
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